[7th February 1924

(*g*) whether the attention of the Government has been drawn to the series of articles about the Dam, which appeared in the issues of the now defunct "Desabaktan", Madras, dated 29th and 30th October 1919, and 1st, 5th and 10th November 1919, and also the issues of the "Panchayat," a monthly published at Trichinopoly, in its Vol. 1, Nos. 11 and 12, and Vol. 2, Nos. 4 and 5; and

(*h*) whether the Government have taken into consideration the objections raised in those articles?

A.—(*a*) In pursuance of the suggestion made by the Secretary of State, negotiations were started in April 1920 and have been proceeding and in the later stages the Consulting Engineer of the Government of India has been helping the Government of Madras and the Mysore Darbar. They have not yet been finally concluded.

(*b*), (*c*) & (*d*) As the negotiations have been proceeding on the basis that they should be treated as confidential and the proceedings should not prejudice either party if the matter is ultimately taken to arbitration, the Government consider that it would be detrimental to public interests to answer these questions.

(*e*) & (*f*) Leading ryots were consulted in August 1922 and will again be consulted if and when necessary.

(*g*) & (*h*) The attention of the Government has now been drawn to the articles referred to.

Report of the "Cauvery Delta Improving Committee."

261 *Q.*—Mr. M. R. SETURATNAM AYYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to publish the report drawn by the "Cauvery Delta Improving Committee"?

A.—Further minutes expected by the President of the Committee from some of the members are still awaited and the question of publishing the report will be considered when they are received and the report is examined.

Embankments on certain rivers in South Kanara.

262 *Q.*—Mr. J. A. SALDANHA: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that recently there were erected on the Gurpur and Mulki rivers in South Kanara bunds or embankments for facilitating irrigation of hundreds of acres of fields by villagers with their own labour and at their own cost;

(*b*) whether these works were ordered to be destroyed on the ground that they obstructed navigation and offended against section 431 of the Indian Penal Code;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the rivers in question were at the time of the erection of the bunds navigable for laden boats only at high tides; and

(*d*) whether it is a fact that in the case of the bund erected without the Collector's permission on the Mulki river by the villagers of Palimar, rice crops of over 500 acres were saved from being destroyed by drought on account of that bund, while only a few boats were prevented from carrying their goods which could be easily transhipped over the bund?

A.—(*a*), (*b*), (*c*) & (*d*) The Government have no information.